Case 1:15-cr-00445-PAE Document 144 Filed 02/09/16 Page 1 of 22

G1r1echc 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 15-CR-445 (PAE) V. 5 WALI BURGOS, JASON BENJAMIN, JONATHAN HARRIS, COREY COOKS, 6 JAHNOMI BENJAMIN, DIQUINN LACEND, KENNETH JENKINS, 7 Defendants. Conference 8 9 New York, N.Y. 10 January 27, 2016 10:48 a.m. 11 12 Before: 13 HON. PAUL A. ENGELMAYER, 14 District Judge 15 **APPEARANCES** 16 PREET BHARARA 17 United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York BY: JAMES M. McDONALD, ESQ. 18 DINA McLEOD, ESQ. 19 Assistant United States Attorneys 20 CHRISTOPHER P. MADIOU, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant Wali Burgos 21 FASULO, BRAVERMAN & DI MAGGIO LLP 22 Attorneys for Defendant Jason Benjamin BY: LOUIS V. FASULO, ESQ. 23 JOSHUA L. DRATEL, ESQ. 24 Attorney for Defendant Jonathan Harris 25 KELLEY J. SHARKEY, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant Corey Cooks

G1r1echc

APPEARANCES
(Continued)
PARKER & CARMODY, LLP Attorneys for Defendant Jahnomi Benjamin BY: DANIEL S. PARKER, ESQ.
CHRISTOPHER P. MADIOU, ESQ.
For ANGUS JAMES BELL, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant Diquinn Lacend
DANIEL S. PARKER, ESQ. FOR DAWN CARDI, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant Kenneth Jenkins
necorney for berendanc nemicen benkins

1	(Case called)
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your
3	appearances for the record.
4	MR. McDONALD: Good morning, your Honor. James
5	McDonald and Dina McLeod for the government.
6	THE COURT: Very good. Good morning.
7	MS. McLEOD: Good morning.
8	MR. FASULO: Louis Fasulo for Jason Benjamin, Fasulo
9	Braverman & DiMaggio. Good morning, Judge.
10	THE COURT: One moment. I think this will be a little
11	easier if we have Mr. Smallman call the roll in order, so I can
12	keep you straight, but I appreciate it.
13	Go ahead.
14	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Wali Burgos.
15	MR. MADIOU: Good morning, your Honor. Christopher
16	Madiou for Mr. Burgos.
17	THE COURT: Very good. Good morning to both of you.
18	Which is Mr. Burgos?
19	Very good. Good morning.
20	DEFENDANT BURGOS: Good morning.
21	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jason Benjamin.
22	MR. FASULO: Louis Fasulo again, Fasulo, Braverman &
23	DiMaggio, for Mr. Benjamin.
24	THE COURT: Which is Mr. Benjamin?
25	Very good. Good morning.

25

1	DEFENDANT JASON BENJAMIN: Good morning.
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jonathan Harris.
3	MR. DRATEL: Good morning, your Honor. Joshua Dratel
4	for Mr. Harris. Mr. Harris is the fourth seat in in the front
5	row.
6	DEFENDANT HARRIS: Good morning.
7	THE COURT: All right. Very good. Good morning,
8	Mr. Dratel. Good morning, Mr. Harris.
9	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Corey Cooks.
10	MS. SHARKEY: Good morning, Judge. Kelley Sharkey for
11	Corey Cooks. I would say Corey Cooks is in the fourth seat in
12	the front row, but I don't want to correct Mr. Dratel.
13	THE COURT: Why don't we have Mr. Cooks raise his
14	hand, please.
15	All right. Very good. Good morning, Ms. Sharkey.
16	Good morning to you, Mr. Cooks. I'm not going to resolve that
17	dispute.
18	DEFENDANT COOKS: Good morning.
19	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Jahnomi Benjamin.
20	MR. PARKER: Daniel Parker on behalf of Mr. Jahnomi
21	Benjamin, who's next to Mr. Cooks.
22	THE COURT: Good morning to you, Mr. Parker, and good
23	morning to you, Mr. Benjamin.
	1

DEFENDANT JAHNOMI BENJAMIN: Good morning.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Diquinn Lacend.

MR. MADIOU: Your Honor, I'm standing up for James 1 Bell, who's Mr. Lacend's attorney, with Mr. Lacend's 2 3 permission. 4 THE COURT: Which is Mr. Lacend? 5 Good morning, Mr. Lacend. Good morning again to you, Mr. Madiou. 6 7 DEFENDANT LACEND: Good morning. THE DEPUTY CLERK: Kenneth Jenkins. 8 9 MR. PARKER: Your Honor, I'm standing in for Ms. Cardi 10 on behalf of Mr. Jenkins. He's the second gentleman in in the 11 front row. I've spoken to Mr. Jenkins and he consents to my 12 appearing. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. And I thank both counsel who 14 are standing in for other counsel for playing that role today. 15 Thank you. 16 Good morning, Mr. Jenkins. 17 DEFENDANT JENKINS: Good morning. 18

THE COURT: You may all be seated.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As I expect everyone is aware, we held an initial conference in this many-defendant case on December 11th. At that time I set an overall schedule, or at least the next date in the case, and I received in quite a lot of detail a report about the case and about the categories of discovery from the government. It was a very helpful presentation. At the time I recognized that certain defendants either hadn't been arrested

yet or hadn't been brought to this courthouse yet, and I asked the government to coordinate with my chambers to arrange a follow-up conference so that you could all physically be here at a conference before me as soon as possible. This is that conference.

At the December 11th conference I asked Mr. McDonald to make sure that a transcript of the December 11th conference was provided to all of the counsel for defendants who weren't physically present on December 11th. The reason was that I needed to set an overall schedule binding everyone, and a lot of useful information was established at that conference that he shared, and I wanted to make sure it was promptly made available to defense counsel and defendants.

So without further ado, Mr. McDonald, have you provided a copy of the transcript of the December 11th conference to each of the counsel for the defendants who are here today?

MR. McDONALD: I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask counsel, each of you, have you shared that transcript -- I'm trying to save time here -- have you shared that transcript with your client?

MR. PARKER: On behalf of Jahnomi Benjamin, I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone not shared the transcript with their client?

MR. DRATEL: I'm in the process of sending it, your Honor. I'm just catching up on a large slew of emails after being away for a week. I will mail it to Mr. Harris.

MS. SHARKEY: Judge, I'm in the same position. I'll provide it to Mr. Cooks.

MR. MADIOU: As am I, Judge.

MR. FASULO: And we will as well, although we did meet with the defendant and go over all $-\!\!-$

THE COURT: Look. I'm going to ask you to get the transcript to your clients pronto. Did you all have a chance to read the transcript?

DEFENSE COUNSEL: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Had you read the transcript, you would have noted my insistence that the transcript be made available to the defendants. The purpose of that was to avoid the need for poor Mr. McDonald to rehash here at great length the architecture of the charges in the case and the discovery. I'll ask you to please get those transcripts to your clients immediately so that they can be up to speed on what was said at that conference.

Is anyone here asking that I ask Mr. McDonald to rehash in detail what he covered at the last conference?

DEFENSE COUNSEL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then just briefly, for the defendants' sake, let me just tell you what you will see when you see the

transcript for those of you who have not. I called on
Mr. McDonald at the initial conference with the other
defendants in this case and asked him to summarize all the
charges that were in the case, and he did that in some detail.
I then asked him to report on the various categories of
discovery, meaning evidence, that the government is in the
process of amassing and sharing, and he did that also in some
detail, and he explained that the discovery would be shared
with defense counsel really in a two-stage process, where
certain discovery would be provided by mid-January and another
set of discovery would be provided by mid-February. When you
read the transcript, you'll see which categories of discovery
fall into which category.

In addition, I had some discussions with counsel for both sides as to the physical mechanics by which defendants who are incarcerated would get access to discovery in the MCC or the MDC, as the case may be, and you'll find those discussions helpful.

I encourage all of you to read those transcripts because it's a very detailed description of the charges and the evidence in the case, okay?

All right. We have a next conference scheduled in the case for March $2^{\rm nd}$, and at that point all the defendants, both the ones who are here as well as the ones who were here at the first conference, will be together and so that will be an

obvious forum to take stock of where we are and where we're going. But as long as I have you here, Mr. McDonald, let me just ask you a few specific questions just to make sure that we're moving efficiently.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Was the government able, by the January 11th deadline you had set for Phase I of discovery, to provide the Phase I discovery materials to all defense counsel?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, the Phase I discovery was made available to the defense counsel on that date. Since then we've been working with the discovery coordinator on the actual mechanics of it. A couple issues have arisen. We'll just inform the Court while we're here what those issues are.

The discovery for the first phase was voluminous. It included approximately — over 140,000 pages of material. It also included substantial electronic material which is not paginated, including pole camera data and including audio recordings of certain intercepts that were intercepted under Title III wiretap authority. We also have been in the process of negotiating a protective order with respect to each of the defendants. The discovery coordinator has agreed to take the discovery from us and to provide it to each of the defense counsel who's agreed to the protective order, while we continue to negotiate the specifics of the protective order. I expect

that we'll be able to resolve any issues and we won't need to trouble the Court with it.

THE COURT: So let me see if I've got this right. By January 11th you were able to provide all the categories of discovery that fall into Phase I to the discovery coordinator. That's Ms. Greenwood. And in effect they're uploaded electronically so they can be accessed by the participating defendants and defense counsel?

MR. McDONALD: Ms. Greenwood doesn't have physical custody of that information yet. Just yesterday she agreed for her office to take control of the uploaded drives, which we expect she'll have today.

THE COURT: So what was it that happened on January 11^{th} ?

MR. McDONALD: On January 11th we submitted an email followed — then January 12th was the letter that had the pagination for each of the Bates—numbered categories of documents that we would provide. Those were made available for inspection at our office for any defense counsel who wanted to come take a look at it while we uploaded the documents and the other material onto the drives for Ms. Greenwood. We also submitted a proposed protective order, asked for comments from defense counsel. The majority of the defense counsel agreed to the protective order as written. Ms. Greenwood had a few edits to it because she wanted to make sure that she was covered by

it. Out of an abundance of caution, we edited it so she would be covered by it. Just last night we got a couple of other responses from one additional defense counsel who's asked for additional changes. We didn't want that to hold up the discovery process, so at that point Ms. Greenwood agreed that she would take it all, that she would then undertake to provide it to the defense counsel who had agreed to the terms of the protective order, and our office has said that if defense counsel would agree to undertake best efforts or agree in concept to the protective order, we would provide the discovery to them, recognizing that they may not have signed the protective order yet and it wouldn't have been so ordered by the Court.

THE COURT: As a practical matter, the way in which the defendants or defense counsel are going to gain access to the discovery here is through the electronic database supervised by Ms. Greenwood.

MR. McDONALD: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And in effect you're basically saying it's now under Ms. Greenwood's supervision, and as individual defense counsel even informally signal their assent to the protective order, they can then, working through Ms. Greenwood, access that material.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor. And I don't know if she has it in her custody yet, but I believe that somebody from

her office was coming around noon today to actually pick up the drives.

THE COURT: As to the protective order, are the terms substantially the same as they were in the Trinitarios case, which is the large gang case that I previously handled, or are there any unusual terms specific to this case?

MR. McDONALD: No, your Honor. They're substantially the same as was used in that case.

THE COURT: Has any defense counsel yet raised any substantive issues with the protective order or are we really talking about details that need to be hashed out?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, last night I received an email from Mr. Dratel raising a few issues. I responded to his email last night. We discussed it this morning. I don't want to speak for Mr. Dratel. I believe that our conversation this morning will either have resolved those issues or we'll be close enough to having resolved those issues that we wouldn't need to trouble the Court with any litigation over it. I don't want to speak for Mr. Dratel.

THE COURT: If there isn't a crystallized dispute, I don't need a report on the state of your negotiations, but as soon as it becomes clear that there is some stumbling block that's preventing an agreement, I want to be called upon to referee it because I want to make sure that well before the next conference, defense counsel have had meaningful access to

as much of the discovery as they can so that the next conference is as useful as possible.

Mr. Dratel, I see you trying to rise.

MR. DRATEL: Well, just, I concur with Mr. McDonald's assessment. I think that we can work it out within the next couple of days. It's just a question of some language, and the government clarified a couple of things that were satisfactory, a couple of things we just have some issues with.

THE COURT: Okay. Good. What about Phase II that you had projected at the next conference was due to be provided February 10th? Are you still on track for that?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor. We are on track for that. There were two categories of discovery, or two things that we had discussed as being included in Phase I which are not included in what I provided to the defense counsel by letter — by email of January 11th and then letter dated January 12th, which are the undercover buy reports. For each of those we're creating a chart that, because there are more than 50 undercover buys, the chart will include the date of the undercover buy, the defendant who we allege was involved in that undercover buy, the quantity of drugs, the type of drug, the amount of money paid, and whether there's audio or video for that, together with the buys that were included for each one. We didn't have all of that information in our — there were a few bits and pieces of that information that we needed

to track down. We now have it all. That's going to be included in the second phase of the discovery.

The second category is the Northern District of New York wiretap material. I mentioned last time that there were two sets of wiretaps in this case. The first is the Southern District of New York wiretap, which was a roving wiretap on the cellular phones used by Marquis Wright over a three-month period. There was also a Northern District of New York wiretap which was on two phones that were used by Jonathan Rodriguez. We didn't have all of that material. We do now have it and we're in the process of processing it. It's voluminous; the audio files in particular. But those will be ready to be produced by the February 10th date.

THE COURT: Very good. All right. Thank you.

One of the things I ordinarily raise at these conferences involves practical problems that have arisen with respect to, for example, the defendants' access to discovery materials. I take it, given the state of play with respect to the Phase I discovery, which is to say that the counsel are only getting it now as they sign on to the protective order, it's premature for any problems like that to have arisen. We don't know yet whether there are any problems being presented by a defendant at the MDC being unable to access on his computer wiretap materials or something like that. It's just too soon.

MR. McDONALD: I think that's right, your Honor. I'll only say that each of these defendants is housed at the MCC. We're working with the MCC, with Ms. Greenwood, and with defense counsel to ensure that they would have access, even after-hours access, to it in the library. I expect that once the drives, which have not yet been provided to the MCC, are provided, that each of the defendants will be able to access them there, but to the extent there's an issue with that, we'll inform the Court.

THE COURT: Look, if form follows from the prior gang case that I supervised, come the second or third conference, there were some issues relating to access, and it tended to be Ms. Greenwood who was the one who would raise them with me, so to the extent I'm able to get involved in expediting solutions, I want to be.

All right. Very good. Mr. McDonald, anything else you want to bring to my attention at this conference?

MR. McDONALD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Defense counsel, one of the things I said at the prior conference was this: Given the scale of the case, group conferences are really not the right forum for individual issues to be raised. And from time to time, in my experience, they're likely to be raised. There might or might not be a bail application, there may be an issue specific to a hiccup with respect to representation, or there

may be applications for the hiring of investigators, things of that nature. I ask that those be raised with me individually. If it's in the nature of something that has to do with budgeting or investigators, an application can be done in writing, and you'll find me very quick and responsive. If it's something that requires a conference, as in the nature of the bail dispute, what you should do is, along with the government, contact my deputy to arrange a one-off conference to deal with those issues.

With that preface, is there anything that any counsel wants to raise at this point?

Yes, Ms. Sharkey.

MS. SHARKEY: Judge, this is all very clear. Thank you for repeating. But I think my client and maybe other clients are a little confused as to when they will have access to the discovery and understanding that the discovery hasn't been disclosed to their attorneys yet. I mean, I know that I signed off on the protected matter a while ago, and my client has been anxious to know about the discovery, and I think we're all tracking it because we've done this before, but I think it's probably a little unclear. Perhaps Mr. McDonald could give an estimate to our clients as to when it will land at the MCC.

THE COURT: Sure. Mr. McDonald, with respect to defendants where the lawyers have signed on to the protective

order and you've given the discovery already to Ms. Greenwood, when will that discovery be accessible to them in the MCC?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, I don't want to speak for Ms. Greenwood because she's going to collect all of the drives from us and then provide them to the MCC, I believe, but I don't think we'll provide the discovery to the MCC until we have agreement from each counsel, at least in principle, to the concept of the protective order, because I don't think we would ask the Marshals to restrict the access of each defendant to the discovery that's provided.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. Then we have a problem where every defendant is held up in his access to the material by the last defense counsel to sign on and so if one defense counsel is asleep at the switch or busy on trial, none of these defendants get access to the discovery material?

MR. McDONALD: I take the Court's point. I don't think that's going to be an issue here, because I think we're very close --

THE COURT: Let me try a little differently. I did not anticipate that. That was not at all what I had in mind. It seems to me the other way to solve this is simply to say to the relevant personnel at the prison, the following people are cleared to get discovery because their lawyer has signed on to the protective order and therefore they ought to get it. But it's not an acceptable situation in a many-defendant case for

everyone to be dragged down by the travails of one unresponsive or disputatious defense counsel. That just doesn't work. It's not fair to everyone else.

MR. McDONALD: That's a better course, your Honor, and what the government will undertake to do is we'll make sure that the drives, which are loaded, will be provided to the MCC by the end of the week. And we will inform the Marshals office of our conversation today. We will make sure that the Marshals know which of the defendants should have access to it. To the extent there are any defendants at that point that should not have access to it -- I expect that by the end of the week each of the defendants will, but to the extent that that's not the case, we will --

THE COURT: So just to be clear, you're going to make sure that by the end of the week the MCC is notified as to the names of all defendants whose counsel have signed on to the protective order such that as soon as Ms. Greenwood gets the material loaded there, those defendants can have access.

Secondly, you'll be proactively in touch with the defense counsel who haven't signed on to convey my urgent desire that an agreement as to the protective order be reached so that that defendant can gain access promptly.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are we on the same page?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. Okay. Do you have any word from Ms. Greenwood as to how quickly she'll be able to get the materials uploaded at the MCC?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, I think I misspoke earlier. I think actually what we're going to do is give one of the drives to Ms. Greenwood, who then will make sure that each of the defense counsel has access to the common discovery. She gave us all the drives, but I believe what we're going to do is we're actually going to give those to the MCC. I don't actually think it's going to go to Ms. Greenwood.

THE COURT: Same question then. When will the MCC have them?

MR. McDONALD: They'll have it by the end of the week.

THE COURT: All right. Let's make sure that happens.

MR. McDONALD: Yes. And I expect they'll have it today, your Honor, but just in case, I'd like to say by the end of the week, in case there are any technological issues that have come up over the last couple hours that I'm not aware of.

THE COURT: Thank you. One thing I said in the transcript last time was that I encouraged the government to be proactive in communicating to individual defense counsel what parts of this massive discovery are uniquely relevant to their client, simply because, as a matter of user friendliness, it's not realistic to ask counsel to go through 140,000 pages and then find Waldo. So I want government counsel to highlight for

defense counsel, without limiting yourself, what appears to be most relevant, what the critical events were, buy busts or whatever they are, so that defense counsel can, as promptly as possible, begin to assess the most consequential discovery for their client.

Ms. Sharkey, does that respond to your concern?

MS. SHARKEY: Yes, it does. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Fasulo?

MR. FASULO: Thank you, Judge. Everything is clear to me. Just to be clear on the record on behalf of my client that we, the lawyers here, currently do not have the discovery so we are not able to share with them yet the discovery, and as soon as we have it, which could be within the next week or so, as soon as Ms. Greenwood, who is getting it today, gets it to us, we will also share what we have with them, just so we're on the same page.

THE COURT: Have you signed the protective order?

MR. FASULO: I have, Judge, yes. I did early on.

THE COURT: Any other defense counsel have anything you want to raise with me while we're all here together?

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. I excluded time globally, including the absent defendants, through March the $2^{\rm nd}$, but just for the record, am I correct that there is no defense counsel who objects to my exclusion of time, given all the

valid things that need to happen between now and then, 1 including beginning your review of discovery? 2 3 MR. PARKER: You are correct. 4 MR. DRATEL: Correct, your Honor. 5 MS. SHARKEY: Yes. 6 MR. FASULO: Yes. And for the record, I discussed it 7 with my client as well. 8 MR. MADIOU: Correct. 9 THE COURT: I put on the record last time the 10 following as well: I asked whether any defendant was at that 11 time seeking a trial date. There was a resounding silence. 12 For the record, is there any defense counsel at this point 13 seeking a trial date? 14 DEFENSE COUNSEL: No. 15 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything that anyone wants to raise today before we adjourn? 16 17 MS. SHARKEY: No, your Honor. Thank you. 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Look, I appreciate everyone's performance of their duties. Government, I 19 20 appreciate the detail in which you laid out the case last time 21 and that you're doing your best to get these phases of 22 discovery to defense counsel promptly. Please be as proactive 23

as you can in making sure that defense counsel sign off on a

protective order and that the material be given both to

Ms. Greenwood and to the relevant jail ASAP.

24

25

Defense counsel, I appreciate your good questions today and your getting out of the gate quickly in this large case. Thank you. We stand adjourned. I'll see all of you on March the 2^{nd} . ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, your Honor.